

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Independent claims 1 and 29 remain in the case. Independent claims 26 and 33, and dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 12-14, 27, 28 and 34-39 have been canceled. New independent claims 40 and 41 and new dependent claims 42-45 have been added.

Previously, the independent article claims in the application were directed to lenses exhibiting "substantially balanced reflectance." Such lenses include (1) antireflective lenses of substantially uniform color, (2) antireflective lenses with visible, balanced color change across the lens and (3) mirror coated lenses with substantially uniform color across the lens.

The Examiner has broadly interpreted the term "substantially balanced reflectance" to reject claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al. ('624) in view of Brandt et al. ('147).

Independent claims 1 and 29, as amended, and new independent claims 40 and 41 do not contain the term "substantially balanced reflectance." Instead, the claims recite ranges of surface curvature and ranges of reflected color difference (ΔE) in terms of CMC color difference units. The specific ranges recited are associated with whether the lens exhibits substantially uniform color in an antireflective coated lens (claims 1 and 29), exhibits visible, balanced color change in an antireflective coated lens (claim 40) or exhibits substantially uniform color in a mirror coated lens (claim 41).

The independent claims have also been amended to indicate that their respectively recited coatings vary substantially in thickness from center to edge. This amendment is

~~intended to distinguish lenses coated by the planetary substrate rotation process discussed at~~

page 2, line 6 et seq. of the specification. New dependent claims 42-45 further recite the thickness variations of at least 20% from center to edge. Support for this limitation is found at various places in the specification including Examples 4 and 5. As explained in the specification, the lens curvature and coating thickness variations make it difficult to produce substantially uniform color or balanced color change across the lens.

This combination of recited limitations in the independent claims are nowhere found in the cited references. The prior art does not disclose coated lenses of the recited curvatures having the recited varying coating thicknesses and the recite color differences (ΔE).

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 29, 40 and 41 and claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Samuel C. Miller, III
Registration No. 27,360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: November 17, 2003 (Monday)